

## Hingtgen, Robert J

---

**From:** Hingtgen, Robert J  
**Sent:** Friday, February 28, 2014 4:30 PM  
**To:** 'Howard Cook'  
**Cc:** Mark Ostrander; Donna Tisdale; evelynsepin@hotmail.com; joe marshall; Fogg, Mindy; Bennett, Jim; Beddow, Donna  
**Subject:** RE: Dudek says that Soitec can do better at construction water needs than SDG&E at ECO

Howard,

Staff will ask Dudek and the applicant for further clarification regarding their statements as reported by you below. I know of no construction standard exemptions or exceptions that would or could be provided to the Soitec project. To my knowledge all construction plans will need to meet all applicable construction code requirements and should address all recommendations by project geotechnical engineers. Final engineering and design would follow the discretionary permit approval process that we are currently in.

The first Section 6952 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding Large Wind Turbines addresses requirements for a Decommissioning Plan and Secured Agreement (Section 6952(j)2 and (j)3 on pages 244 and 245 of 272 at the following link:

<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/zoning/z6000.pdf>

The second Section 6952 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding Solar Energy Systems includes a paragraph regarding security for removal (Section 6952(b)3(d) on page 247 of 272 at the same link as above.)

As you are aware, the Zoning Ordinance applies only to those areas within the County's jurisdiction and the proposed Soitec project sites are in the County's jurisdiction. That said, staff will develop more specific conditions for project decommissioning that would be part of the Major Use Permit Decision(s) if and when the proposed project (in some form or other) goes to hearing.

Staff will develop more detailed responses to your questions/comments as part of our Responses to Comments phase.

Thank you,

Robert Hingtgen, Planner III  
Planning & Development Services  
5510 Overland Ave., Suite 310  
San Diego, CA 92123  
M.S. O-650  
Tel - (858) 694-3712  
email - [robert.hingtgen@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:robert.hingtgen@sdcounty.ca.gov)

---

**From:** Howard Cook [<mailto:howwcook@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 27, 2014 11:52 AM  
**To:** Hingtgen, Robert J; Bennett, Jim  
**Cc:** Howard Cook; Mark Ostrander; Donna Tisdale; [evelynsepin@hotmail.com](mailto:evelynsepin@hotmail.com); joe marshall  
**Subject:** Dudek says that Soitec can do better at construction water needs than SDG&E at ECO

Soitec Solar Development Project PEIR, Log number 3910 120005

Dear Robert,  
Please put this in the record for the Soitec Project PEIR, Log no. 3910-120005

I was a speaker at the Jacumba Community Services District JCSD monthly meeting, this past Tuesday 02/25. Also in attendance, at the request of the JCSD were Trey Driscoll representing Dudek and Pat Brown of Soitec.

In my presentation, which included the escalation of water use at ECO/Boulevard Substation from 30 million gallons of water to a current 92-95 million gallons for the rough total of 100 acres for that construction. I also then, projected the construction water use on the 1500 acres of similar construction on the Soitec Project to an estimated construction water use of one billion to one billion five hundred million gallons of water (this has previously been commented on to the Soitec PEIR)

After Trey Driscoll and Pat Brown made their presentation, I was discussing the Soitec construction water use with Trey Driscoll. He told me that Soitec did not need the same rigor of construction employed at ECO substation, gen-tie, and therefore would incur a lower water use. He specifically talked about soil compaction and cement construction to lesser standards. Oh, and Pat Brown said that Soitec might be willing to revise their construction water estimates, if required.

My concerns to the County of San Diego DPLU include: what are the construction standards for the Soitec Project and what differences are there in construction standards compared to the San Diego County based ECO/Boulevard with gen-tie project? How are these differences justified and are special exemptions, exceptions being given to Soitec? Another concern is that many of the Soitec projects are located in a flood prone zone, especially Rugged, and if anything, soil compaction, drainage, cement and other construction standards should be higher than at ECO/Boulevard. There is also the risk that foreign companies like Soitec and Ibredola could sustain flood damage and decide to abandon their projects and leave without fixes or compensation. Has the county considered asking Soitec and Ibredola to set up a bond, insurance or a trust fund to protect the County and local residents from such an eventuality?

These concerns also need to be answered by Dudek and Soitec. Ibredola and Soitec are sharing a gen-tie line and other resources, so Ibredola must also be included as to these concerns.

Thank You,  
Howard W Cook